

✓-0



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/175,589	10/20/98	JACOBSON	A 12369.50501

023552
MERCHANT & GOULD
P O BOX 2903
MINNEAPOLIS MN 55402-0903

TM11/1019

EXAMINER
HU, R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2172	5

DATE MAILED: 10/19/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trad marks

6

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/175,589

Applicant(s)
Jacobson

Examiner
RUAY LIAN HO

Group Art Unit
2771



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Oct 20, 1998

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1035 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claim

☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☒ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☒ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☐ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 2,3

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 2771

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371© of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

2. Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sakano et al. (USPN 5,786,817).

Regarding claim 1:

Each and every element of claim 1 is disclosed by Sakano et al., note: the claimed 'creating an electronic tag that uniquely identifies an electronic record' is shown in col.4, 1.9-16, the claimed 'storing the electronic tag' is shown in col.1, 1.41, the claimed 'distributing the electronic record' is shown in col.2, 1.27-35.

Regarding claim 2:

The claimed 'purging the electronic record comprising the steps of deleting the electronic record and selectively deleting the electronic tag' is shown in col.1, 1.42-49.

Regarding claim 3:

Claim 3 is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 1.

Regarding claim 4:

Art Unit: 2771

Claim 4 is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 2.

Regarding claim 5:

The claimed 'a registry and a user profile' is shown in col.4, l.12-16,
the claimed 'analyzing a network user's workstation specifications' is shown in col.2, l.15-35,
the claimed 'analyzing a network user's profile' is shown in col.4, l.12-16,
the claimed 'generating a reference code, wherein the electronic tag is generated from information analyzed in the network user's workstation specification, the network user's user profile, and the reference code' is shown in col.4, l.12-65.

Regarding claim 6:

The claimed 'reading stored electronic tags and generating an electronic tag in response to accessing an electronic record' is shown in col.4, l.9-16.

Regarding claim 7:

Claim 7 is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 6.

Regarding claim 8:

The claimed 'a classification code and an index code' is shown in col.4, l.36-65.

Regarding claim 9:

The claimed 'business E-mail, personal E-mail, intramail, bulletin board, minutemail, and purgemail' is shown in col.4, l.9-16.

The nature of the E-mail does not entitle any patentable weight.

Art Unit: 2771

Regarding claim 10:

The claimed 'index code identifies the contents of an electronic record and the sender or recipient of the electronic record' is shown in col.4, 1.1-16.

Regarding claim 11:

Claim 11 is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 9.

Regarding claim 12:

Claim 12 is rejected for the similar rationale given for claims 5 and 6.

Regarding claim 13:

Claim 13 is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 1.

Regarding claim 14:

Claim 14 is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 2.

Regarding claim 15:

Claim 15 is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 4.

Regarding claim 16:

Claim 16 is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 5.

Regarding claim 17:

Claim 17 is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 1.

Regarding claim 18:

Claim 18 is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 2.

Regarding claim 19:

Art Unit: 2771

Claim 19 is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 3.

Regarding claim 20:

Claim 20 is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 4.

Regarding claim 21:

Claim 21 is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 5.

Regarding claim 22:


Claim 22 is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 6.

3. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ruay L. Ho whose telephone number is (703) 305-3834. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 10 am to 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Yen Vu, can be reached on (703) 305-4393. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 308-9051 or (703) 308-5403.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3800.


RUAY LIAN HO
PRIMARY EXAMINER